

should be in this country, so long as a large portion of the laborers are held as slaves; nor can the wages

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to draft a letter to the Loyal National Repeal Association of Ireland, expressing the sentiments of the members of the Association, which said report shall be forwarded together, with a copy of these resolutions, to that Association.

Resolved, That this meeting confidently expects that the communication of the National Committee will be received with satisfaction by the Loyal National Repeal Association; and that the letter of Mr. Disney will be disavowed as never having been sanctioned by it, and that an intention to censure the Liberator or any other person, who has been guilty of such conduct, will be co-operated heartily with the Cincinnati Association, in raising funds to promote the cause of Repeal. But, should this expectation be disappointed, we will take measures for making a separate contribution to that cause at the adjourned meeting.

The meeting was then addressed in very able and eloquent addresses by Messrs. O'Connell and O'Connell, who were frequently interrupted by enthusiastic cheers, and on motion, the report and resolutions were unanimously adopted.

imously adopted. The resolution of this meeting appointed the committee to draft the letter to O'Connell, and that the meeting adjourn to meet again on Saturday evening the 2d of December next.

Ordered, that the proceedings of this meeting be published in the city papers.

SAMUEL LEWIS, *Chairman,*
E. HARRINGTON, {
T. HEATON, { *Secretaries.*

Joshua Leavitt and the Emancipator.

We beg leave to say to our correspondent 'Amicus,' that we should have admitted his communication, if we had not already published the same argument in behalf of Mr. Leavitt, in Mr. Leavitt's own piece. We take this opportunity to remark further, that the friends of Mr. Leavitt must not presume too much upon our liberality. We have re-produced in these columns all he has written upon the subject. Further, we will not, without very strong reasons, allow any longer the circulation of his articles against every statement of the adverse side and

even against the particular passages on which he comments, and misrepresents. This is so gross and palpable a violation of the most ordinary editorial courtesy and morality, that, for the sake of the general interests of the press, we cannot suffer the scandal to continue without repeating our earnest remonstrance.

Some time ago, our readers were informed that Mr. Leavitt charged the editor of the Standard with having made wilful mis-statements in respect to the 'Embezzlement of the Emancipator.' We civilly requested him to specify; declaring, repeatedly, that if he would point out any error, we would cheerfully correct it. He has not attempted to do any

has never gone so far as to use the epithet of lying in the Standard. A correspondent, *Edgar Wright*, Jr., has proceeded to a still greater height of presumption and injustice, and characterized the entire statement as a lie, and declared, in a tone of affected triumph, "It has been contradicted in the proper quarter." Contradicted! Do you deluded brother Wright, suppose that in this intelligent country, where we suppose that, in this intelligent country, where we free spirit of inquiry, its free press, and its habitual contempt of mere authority, contradiction will pass current for refutation? To bring that about, it would be necessary that the opposer should not only be a priest, but also a priest of the Inquisition. Mr. Leavitt is a priest of the opposite order, and in this language in which this noble priest of opposition has delivered their assertions, we have to observe that we believe they have both read enough in the horn-

book of the law, to learn that 'mere scurrility or opprobrious words, which neither in themselves import, nor are, in fact, attended with any injurious ef-

We have greatly mistaken the character of the mass of Liberty party men, if they countenance such conduct.—*National Anti-Slavery Standard.*

From the Philanthropist.

Slavery in the District of Columbia.

We find the following in the newspapers. It is stated to be an extract from a conversation of Mr. Clay with Mr. Wise, as given in the Madisonian of April 17, 1843, from the Richmond Enquirer. In

the conversation, Mr. Wise says to Mr. Clay—
 "But on the subject of abolition of slavery in the District, Mr. Clay, you admit the power of Congress to act upon the subject, upon the principle of 'exclusive legislation.' " My dear sir," rejoined Mr. Clay, "I have these two opinions, conventionally formed, I am the son of Virginia, a slaveholder in Kentucky. (F) AND I WOULD SUFFER THE TORTURES OF THE INQUISITION, BEFORE I WOULD SIGN A BILL HAVING FOR ITS OBJECT THE SUBVERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THIS DISTRICT. (F) OR IN ANY MANNER GIVE COUNTENANCE TO THE PROJECT." (F)

Attempt to Decoy away Slaves.

A correspondent in the Baltimore Sun, dated Washington, D. C., 25th inst. mentions the fact that no less than ten colored persons were apprehended on the premises of a colored man named John Bush, residing east of the City Hall, and were about to be decoyed away from their masters, and intended going to Canada. The letter states that two males and three females belonging to Robert Beall, Esq.; one male, slave of Henry N. Young, Esq.; one male, slave of the City Hall, and one female, a woman and two children belonging to Mr. McDonald, on Capitol Hill. Three others were to have completed the party, as follows: woman belonging to D. A.

Hall, Esq.; woman owned by Mr. Allison Nailor, and a woman living with a Mr. James; these did not arrive in time to be arrested; their baggage was in the wagon. A wagon had been all prepared to carry the slaves off. Bush was arrested, and gave bail in the sum of \$500, to appear at Court. The absconding negroes were put in prison for safe keeping.

We give to-day, under what we deem an appropriate heading, the first half of O'Connell's powerful and scathing address to the Irish Repellers of Cincinnati. It is indeed a bold and masterly effort.

completely overwhelming and annihilating the wretched sophistry by which Irishmen and others have attempted to defend American slavery from the merited execration of earth and heaven. Every reader of our paper—every friend of truth and right—every one who cares for his race, will be profited by the perusal of this most able and timely article. It will appear in our next—*Herald-Journal*.

looccupy!—*Ohio Register.*

Slavery—The Evil—The Remedy.

To the Editor:

And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? I indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that, considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible evils; that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest. —Jefferson's Notes on Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson never thought of the absurdity of debating the question whether slavery be an evil, nor was he indulgent to the delusive idea that it would be perpetual. He reduced the subject to its certain elements: the master must liberate the slave, or the slave will exterminate the master. This conclusion is the necessary result of the history of the past. The same color in the ancient republics enabled the state to use emancipation as a safety-valve; yet notwithstanding the thorough amalgamation of the freed man with the free born, servile was nearly extinguished by violence the noble nations of antiquity; while no man dare say that slavery was the cause of their ultimate ruin. But if his justice should sleep forever, and the tragedy so awfully predicted should never occur, still we must regard slavery as the greatest evil that ever cursed a nation.

Slavery is an evil to the slave, by depriving nearly three millions of men of the best gift of God to man—liberty. I stop here—this is enough of itself to give us a full anticipation of the long catalogue of human woe, and physical, intellectual and moral abasement which follow in the wake of slavery.

Slavery is an evil to the master. It is utterly subversive of the Christian religion. It violates the great law upon which that religion is based, and on account of which it values its preeminence. It corrupts and debases by necessary consequence with an abandoned and degraded race, ingrafting in the young mind and heart all the vices and none of the virtues.

It is the source of indolence, and destructive of all industry, which in times past among the wise has ever been regarded as the first friend of religion, morality and happiness. The poor despise labor, because slavery makes it degrading. The mass of slaveholders are idlers.

It is the mother of ignorance. The system of Common Schools has not succeeded in a single slave State. Slavery and Education are natural enemies. In the free States, one in 33, over 51 years, is unable to read and write. In the slave States, one in 133 is unable to write and read!

It is opposed to literature even in the educated classes. Noble aspirations and true glory depend upon virtue and good to man. The constant injustice of slavery hangs as a millstone about the necks of the sons of genius, and will not let them up!

It is destructive of all mechanic arts, and of the free States build ships and steam cars for the nations of the world—the slave States import the handles of their axes—the primitive tools of the architect. The educated population will not work at all—the uneducated must work without science, and of course without skill. If there be a given amount of mechanical genius among a people, it is of necessity developed in proportion as a whole or part of the population are educated. In the slave States, the small portion educated is inert.

It is antagonistic to the Fine Arts. Creations of beauty and sublimity are embodiments of the soul's imaginings: the fountain must surely be pure and placid whence so glorious and immortal and lovely images are reflected. Liberty has ever been the mother of the arts.

It retards Population and Wealth. Compare New York and Virginia, Tennessee and Ohio—States of equal natural advantages and equal ages. The wealth of the free States is in a much greater ratio, even superior to that of the slave States, than the population of the free is greater than that of the slave States. The Manufacturers of the slave are compared with those of the free States, are as 1 to 4, nearly, as is shown by statistics. I consider the accumulation of wealth in a less ratio.

It impoverishes the soil and defaces the loveliest features of nature. Washington advises a friend to remove from Pennsylvania to Virginia—saying that cheap lands in Virginia were as good as the dear lands in Pennsylvania, and anticipating the abolition of slavery, would be more productive. His anticipations have perished—slavery still exists, the soil is wild and the fields are now there the field growth and the inhabitants!

It induces national poverty. Slaves consume more and produce less than freemen. Hence illusive wealth, prodigality and bankruptcy, without the capability of bearing adversity or recovering from its influence; then come despair, dishonor and crime. It is an evil to the free laborer, by forcing him by the laws of competition—supply and demand—to work for the wages of the slave, food and shelter. The poor, in the slave States, are the most destitute native population in the United States.

It sustains the public sentiment in favor of the deadly and cruel—the duel—those relics of a barbarous age.

It is the mother and the nurse of Lynch Law, which I regard as the most horrid of all crimes, not even excepting parricide, which ancient legislators thought too impossible to be ever supposed in the legal code. If all the blood shed in the South could be gathered together, the world would be dyed in the blood of the cruelty of its judges, would grow pale in view of this greater terror.

Where all these evils exist, how can Liberty, Constitutional Liberty, live? No indeed, it cannot, and has not existed in conjunction with slavery. We are but nominal freemen, for though born to all the privileges known to the Constitution, we are written and prescribed, we have seen struck down with the leaden hand of slavery, the most glorious banner that freedom ever bore in the face of man—'Trial by Jury—Liberty of Speech and of the Press.' The North may be liable to censure in Congress for freedom of speech—may lose the privileges of the Post-Office and the Right of Petition and perhaps yet be free—but we of the land of slavery are ourselves slaves! Also for the hypocritical cry of liberty and equality which demagogues sound forever in our ears! The Declaration of Independence comes back from all nations, not in notes of triumph and self-assertion, but in the great world of Freedom—making us infidels in the great world of Freedom—raising up to ourselves idols of wood and stone, inscribed with the name of Deity, where the invisible and true God can never dwell. The blood of the heroes of '76 has been shed in vain. The just expectations of Hamilton and Franklin and Sherman and Morris and Adams of the North, are betrayed by the continuance of slavery. The fond anticipations of Washington and Jefferson, Madison and Mason of the South, have not been realized. The great experiment of Republican Government has not been fairly tested. If the Union should not be perpetual, or the American name be synonymous with that of liberty in all coming time, Slavery is at once the cause, the crime, and the avenger!

Are we indeed of that vain and Saxon blood, which no dangers can appal, no obstacles obstruct, and shall we sit with shivering limbs and dewy feet by the running stream, with insane features and stolid gaze, expecting this flood of evil to flow past, leaving the channel dry? We who can conquer all things else, shall we be conquered by this? Are the fowls free in the wide heavens, the fishes secure in the depths of the ocean, the beasts untrammelled in the forest wilds, and shall man only, immortal, be doomed to hopeless servitude? Yes, there is a remedy.

There is one of four consequences to which slavery inevitably leads: A continuance of the present relative position of the master and the slave, both as to numbers, intelligence and physical power; Or an extermination of the blacks; Or an extermination of the whites; Or emancipation and removal, or emancipation and a community of interests between the races.

The present relative position, between the blacks and whites (even if undisturbed by external influences, which we cannot hope) cannot long continue. Statistics of numbers show that in the whole slave States, the black increases on the white population. The duller eye can see that the African, by association with the white race, is improved in intellect, and by being transferred to a temperate climate, and forced to labor and throw off the influence of his native land, he is increased in physical power; while the white, by the same reverse of laws, is retrograding in the same respects. Slavery, then, cannot remain for ever as it is. That the black race will be exterminated seems hardly probable from the above reflections, and because the great mass of human passions will be in favor of the in-

crease of the slaves and infinitum. Pride, love of power, blind avarice, and many other passions are for it, and against it only in the opposite scale. We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion, that the slave population must increase till there is no retreat but in the extermination of the whites. Athens, Sparta, Sicily, and Rome nearly, have in modern times, did fall by servile wars. I have shown elsewhere, that the slavery of the blacks in the modern, is more dangerous than the slavery of the whites in the ancient system; then, the intelligent slave was incorporated into the high caste of quondam masters, an eternal safety-valve, which yet did not save from explosions eminently disastrous.

The negative of the second proposition, then, establishes the third, unless we avail ourselves of the last—emancipation. If my reasoning and facts be correct, there is not a sane mind in all the South who would not agree with me, that if we can be saved from the first named evil, by all means emancipation. Emancipation is entirely safe. Sparta and Athens turned the slaves by thousands into freedom with safety, who fought bravely for their common country. During the Revolution, many emancipated slaves did good service in the cause of liberty. We learn from Mr. Gurney and other sources to be relied upon, that British West India emancipation has been entirely successful, and productive of none of those evils which are so much dreaded. I foretell by interested pro-slavery men. There are regiments of black men, who make fine soldiers—protectors, not enemies of the empire. But above all, I rely not upon sound *a priori* reasoning only, but rather upon actual experience. There are in the United States, by the last census, 366,265 free blacks; 170,758 of these are in the free, the remainder in the slave States. There are also 2,485,145 slaves—so that in fact about one sixth of the whole black race in America are already free! No danger or evil consequence has ensued from the residence of these 366,265 freedmen among us. Who then will be so absurd as to contend that the liberation of the other five-sixths will endanger the safety or happiness of the whites? I repeat, then, that emancipation is entirely safe.

Emancipation must either be by the voluntary consent of the masters, or by force of law. I regard voluntary emancipation as the most probable, the most desirable, and the most practicable. For the slaveholding landholder would be thereby relieved of the burden of the loss of the value of the land would compensate for the loss in slaves. A comparison of the price of lands of equal quality in the free and slave States will prove this conclusively. If, however, by force of law—the law having once sanctioned slaves as property, the great principle which is recognized by the civilized governments, that private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation, dictates that slaves should not be liberated without the consent of the masters, or without paying an equivalent to the owners. Under the sanction of law, one man invests the proceeds of his labor in slaves, another in land; in the course of time, it becomes necessary to the common weal to buy up the land, and the distribution or culture in common—how should the tax be laid? Of course upon lands, slaves and personal property—in a word, upon the whole property of the whole people. If, on the other hand, it should nearly concern the safety and happiness of society, both the slaveholder and non-slaveholder, that slaves should be taken and emancipated by the law, the same legitimate course of reasoning, the whole property of the State should be taxed for the purpose. If emancipation shall take place by force of law, shall it be by the laws of the States or by the law of Congress? Let Congress abolish slavery wherever she has jurisdiction—in the military places, in the territories, and in the high seas, in the District of Columbia, if the contents of session with Virginia and Maryland allow. I lay down the broad rule, that Congress should do no more for the perpetuation of slavery than she is specially bound to do. The debates in the Federal Convention prove, that the free States did not intend to assume the responsibility of slavery. In the language of Roger Sherman and others, they could not acknowledge the right of 'property in man.' There is then no moral obligation in the Union to sustain the rights of the South in slaves, except only they are morally bound to regard the contract with the South, and in the construction of that contract, the assumption in all cases is in favor of Liberty. On the contrary, the United States are morally bound, by all means consistent with the Constitution, to extinguish slavery. The word slave is not used in the Constitution, because the promises of all the southern members of the Convention led to find emancipation, and the word slave was induced by the expulsion of the word from the Charter of Human Liberty. I cannot agree that there is any law superior to that of the Federal Constitution. It is the part of Christians to model human laws after the Divine code; but the present state of light from on high, must be paramount to the Bible itself. If any other practice should prevail, the confusion of religious interpretations of the Divine Will would be endless and insufferable. In the country where Jews, Christians and Infidels, and Deists and Catholics and Protestants and Unitarians and Methodists and Baptists and Shakers, all are concentrated into one nation, it would be subversive of all governmental action, if each sect should set up a Divine code as each 'understands it,' superior to the Constitution itself. If a case ever arises where conscience dictates a different doctrine—the penalty of the law is rather to be borne than to be brought into obedience—then also arises at the same time a case where the sufferer must look to God only for approbation and sustenance—he has passed from all appeal to mankind.

I dissent, then, from the ultra anti-slavery and the ultra pro-slavery men. I cannot join the North in the violation of the Constitution—I cannot join the South in asking the moral sanction of the North; nor do I regard it as a breach of the constitutional compact that she should seek a higher grade of civilization by using all legal means for the entire expulsion of slavery in the United States. Congress having no power over slavery in the States, the States, each one for itself, the Constitution does not forbid, certainly has and should exercise the power of purchase and emancipation. In Kentucky, the Constitution forbids the Legislature to act upon the subject. We must therefore look to a Convention, or that which I most hope, to voluntary emancipation. Enlightened self-interest, humanity and religion are moving on with slow yet irresistible force, to that final result. Let the whole North, in conjunction with the patriotic of the South, withdraw the moral sanction and legal power of the Union from the sustenance of slavery; then our existence as a people with undivided interests may yet be consummated.

May the Ruler of all nations, the common Father of all men, who is no respecter of persons, and whose laws are not violated with impunity by individuals nor by States, move us to be just, happy and free. May that spirit which has been eternally consecrated in the adoration of men Salamis and Marathon, and Bunker's Hill and Yorktown, inspire our hearts, till the glorious principles of seventy-two shall be fully vindicated, and throughout the land shall be established, 'Liberty and Union, one and inseparable, now and for ever.' C. M. CLAY.

Lexington, Ky. Nov. 1843.

The Annexation of Texas.

For some time past the papers have alluded, in various terms, to a plot, said to be hatching between President Houston of Texas and the British government, which carried into effect might be highly detrimental to the interests of the United States. It was represented that certain accredited agents of the British government were working with might and main to effect the abolition of slavery in Texas—that a project was on foot that would end in the final addition of that country to the list of British provinces; and the most urgent appeals to the government of the United States, to take the necessary steps to prevent the execution of this project, were being made. It has been hinted that the correspondence and documents developing this awful plot, are to form the ground upon which President Tyler is to propose the annexation of Texas, and that they will be published with the annual message. It is now stated on the authority of a highly respectable journal in New-Orleans which was unwittingly made the instrument of creating the alarm in the first place, that it is satisfied all this clamor has been raised principally for the purpose of creating excitement among the people of the Southern States, in order, on one hand, to serve the views of certain disloyal politicians in this country, and, on the other hand, to frighten the North into an effort in favor of the annexation of Texas to the Union, for the benefit of schemers and speculators in Texas. It regards all the reports respecting the alleged plot as completely without foundation as can be well imagined. This is not the first instance where Capt. Tyler has been humbugged.

Remarks of J. N. Buffum, of Lynn.

At the great meeting in Faneuil Hall, Nov. 18, 1843.

MR. PRESIDENT.

The gentleman in the gallery (Mr. Tucker) complains that professional men have attempted to force their opinions upon the meeting. I rise to say a word, not as a professional man, nor as a mechanic, (although I belong to the latter class,) but as a man having a deep interest in this question. Nor do I wish to force my opinions upon any, farther than they find a ready response in their hearts. Truth is truth, whether it comes from professional men or the humblest laborer.

My friend Mr. O'Brien charges us with a want of sympathy with the cause of Repeal. I would ask that gentleman, who aided him in getting up the meetings in Lynn? (the town where I belong.) Were they not abolitionists, to a man? Such was the fact, whether he knew or not.

The same gentleman complains, and deems it an insult, that we have attempted to force the opinions of O'Connell down his throat: he accuses it with indignation. At the last Repeal meeting held in Lynn, I spoke of some of the reasons why I, being a Repealer, and deeply sympathizing with Ireland and all her peaceable efforts to free herself from the oppression of the English aristocracy, could not see full faith in our Repeal Association at home. I pointed to the fact, that Robert Tyler and Richard M. Johnson, and other slaveholders were in full fellowship in their meetings. 'Why need you care for that?' said Mr. O'Brien; 'they are not the movement; they are not at the head; I point you to Daxton, the great abolitionist, who is now in the city. If we insisted him and the Repealers, this evening, by calling them together to listen to their great champion on the question of liberty; then he committed the first offence, by pointing me to O'Connell as one whose opinions outweighed all the slaveholders in the land! But he was right. I believe he is of more consequence than all of them. We ought to esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my admiration of the man. I would give more to see him than any other man now living; but for a slaveholding Repealer, I have no respect. I would esteem him a man, who has the profoundest advocacy of universal liberty; and the last address from him, which has just been read, has done more to heighten my

WHOLE NUMBER, 575.

LIBERATOR

STON

G. DECEMBER 15.

ing at Philadelphia

the American Anti-Slavery

a resolution adopted

of the Society in May

Philadelphia, on the

Had to order by J. M.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison

of the Vice-Pres-

ry Center, Richard

Johnson, Vice-President

Mary Green, and

the object of the meet-

the 10th anniversary of

expressed the hope

and before the meet-

love and harmony, and

the friends of freedom

principles within the

ten years were had

free indeed, as the

it would no longer be

tyrant or a slave.

Sentiments, when A. V.

ing resolution was offered

experience of the past

cause for confidence in

in this city ten years

ization of this Society,

a glorious victory over

handed together to

to move, Frederick

White, Lucretia Mott,

were appointed a

M. C. Burleigh, T. C.

Bradburn, Frederick

S. S. Foster, Sarah

Wm. Whipper.

They reported the fol-

Society reiterates the

meeting, that a total

parties and needs in

four causes.

and laid on the table

to allow the passage

of the day for 12 o'clock.

S. Foster offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That while our views of the transfer

of the Emancipator remain unchanged, and we cordially

approve the course of the Standard in laying the facts

concerned with that transaction before the public, that

abolitionists who have recently come into the ranks

may have a full understanding of them, we do not

of the Liberty party, as a body, responsible for the

of Mr. Leavitt and his confidants, in as much

as a large majority of the party had no part in the

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

of the Standard, and we would not wish to be

The special assignment, the free labor resolve, was now taken up, and supported by T. White, M. C. Burleigh, Thos. Hamilton, Sarah Pugh, Lindsey Costes, Lucretia Mott, and Mary Green; and opposed by Stephen S. Foster, Thomas Earle, George Bradburn, David L. Child, and Sidney H. Gay.

The resolve was, on motion, laid on the table.

S. S. Foster offered the following:

Resolved, That it is the wish of this Society, that the business meetings of its Executive Committee, from the earliest practicable date, be held at Boston, in order to secure the counsel and active co-operation of its President, and those members of the Committee who reside in that vicinity, unless a majority of the Committee should deem it inexpedient.

This resolve was laid on the table to allow the passage of the following substitute, offered by J. A. Collins:

Resolved, That this Society recommends, that that portion of the Constitution, which makes it necessary to have the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society located in New York city, be so altered at the next annual meeting, that the Executive Committee may be located in any part of the country which the Society may select.

The secretaries were directed to inform the Executive Committee of the passage of the above resolve.

The following resolve was then adopted:

Resolved, That, although correct political action will be one of the natural results of the reception of anti-slavery truth, yet, for the promulgation of that truth, we continue to rely, as we did ten years ago, mainly on those moral influences which operate on the understanding and the conscience—the opposition of moral purity to moral corruption, the destruction of error by the potency of truth, the overthrow of prejudice by the power of love, and the abolition of slavery by the spirit of reformation.

The following resolve was taken up:

Resolved, That we regard the project of annexing Texas to these United States as designed for the extension and perpetuation of slavery, the slave trade, and slaveholding tyranny and extortion through the land, as unjust and perfidious to Mexico and to this country, and equivalent, if accomplished, to a dissolution of the Union.

Thomas Earle moved to amend, by inserting the words, "as a slaveholding State," after the word Texas. The amendment was lost, and the resolution adopted.

Thos. Earle then offered the following protest:

The undersigned protests against the adoption of the resolution in relation to Texas, because this Society refused to insert the words, "as a slaveholding State," thus pronouncing against the annexation even slavery slavery into a conclusive to settle questions of politics, having no necessary connection with the anti-slavery cause; because it declares its annexation would be unjust and perfidious to Mexico; being a question with which this Society has nothing to do;—because it undertakes to declare that the admission of Texas, either as a slave or free State, would be equivalent to a dissolution of the Union, which is a question with which this Society has nothing to do; and because its adoption can serve no practical purpose, other than to advance the ambitious designs of perfidious politicians, who have betrayed, and again would betray the anti-slavery cause. I would add, that I am opposed to the admission of Texas as a slaveholding State, and would have voted for a resolution to that effect.

THOMAS EARLE.

On motion of C. C. Burleigh, it was resolved, that this Society disclaims the interpretation given to its adoption of the resolution concerning Texas, by the protest of Thomas Earle.

The Committee on writing an address to the abolitionists of this country were, on motion, excused from said duty.

The resolutions concerning JONAS QUINCY ADAMS were taken from the table for discussion. A motion was made to refer them to the next annual meeting, which was lost, and they were finally, after a long debate, referred to a Committee of five, to report thereon at the next annual meeting. The following persons were appointed as the Committee—Thos. Earle, D. L. Child, Robert Purvis, J. Miller McKim, and George Bradburn.

The resolutions are as follow:

Whereas, this Society has heretofore expressed its approval of a portion of the public conduct of JONAS QUINCY ADAMS, supposed to have some connection with the subject of slavery; and from the views taken by the people of this country, and of the civilized world, of his supposed connection with the anti-slavery enterprise, his acts and opinions may be taken as generally receiving our countenance and approbation;

Therefore, we feel imperiously bound publicly to protest against the course of JONAS QUINCY ADAMS, for the following among other reasons, viz:

Because he has asserted, in substance, that the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia would be a violation of the principles of the Declaration of American Independence, which proclaims the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Because he has asserted that the repeal, by Congress, without the consent of a majority of the people of the District of Columbia, of that law by which the people of the whole Union aid in enslaving men in that District, would be a violation of republican principles, and especially of the doctrine of the right of the majority to govern; thus in effect conceding to the people of that District the right to make the whole Union confederates in their crimes, but denying the right of the whole Union to suppress those crimes.

Because he has alleged that with the Constitution as it is, and implied that even with a change of the Constitution, the government cannot rightfully emancipate any of the present generation of slaves, either in the territories of the Union or elsewhere.

Because he has proposed to suffer not only the present generation of slaves, but also all born of slave parents for seven years yet to come, to live and die in a state of servitude—forced so to remain by the act of the government and people of this Union.

Because he has recently proclaimed the absurd dogma, that it is "impossible" to abolish slavery in this country until it shall have been first abolished by the "barbarian people" of Africa.

Because he has declared that the principles of democracy are those of truth and Christianity, and that every man who professes democracy, and holds a slave, has hypocritically stamped on his forehead; and yet he has recently applauded a professor of democracy, the owner of some fifty slaves, and the avowed opponent of emancipation, gradual or immediate, as not only one of the ablest men with whom he has ever cooperated, but also one of the most amiable and worthy; and this in a manner uncalculated for, and with an apparent intention of promoting the success of that slaveholder as a candidate for the first office in our government.

Because he supported the admission of Arkansas into the Union as a slaveholding State, and has avowed himself favorable to the admission of Florida in the same manner.

Because he has recently published a doubt, whether it is not better for Africa to be in slavery in America, than in freedom in their native country.

Because he has lately proclaimed, in reference to slavery, the doctrine that the laws of man are entitled to more obedience than the laws of God.

Because while he has often expressed the utmost indignation and the severest censure, in reference to encroachments by slaveholders upon the rights of northern freemen, he has rarely uttered a word to portray the manifold wrongs done to the slave, to express the least indignation at those wrongs, or to excite the least feeling of commiseration on his behalf.

Because after having for years amused the abolitionists with the idea that he believed immediate emancipation in the District of Columbia constitutional, and with the hope that he would support it as soon as a majority should favor it, he has recently crushed those hopes by the announcement, for the first time, of a different construction of the Constitution.

Because, while holding a seat in Congress by the votes of abolitionists, he has never attempted to obtain a vote of that body on any measure for effecting the emancipation of a single slave, or for effecting the abolition of slavery any where, by any process, either gradual or immediate.

Because he avowed that his object, in wishing to refer petitions for immediate abolition in the District of Columbia to a committee, was to put the question permanently to rest in the negative; and he also declared that the southern members of Congress often expressed his opinions on this subject more scurrily than those of the North.

Because while professing to be the defender of the right of petition, and in some cases nobly sustaining that right, he has, nevertheless, as moved and obtained the passage of a rule, which consigned our petitions privately to the Speaker for suppression, without any public announcement of the fact of their presentation; and he has, from the time of the proposed resolutions for censuring him, to the present day, altogether neglected or refused to present a single one of the petitions directed to him of the same character with that which led to the motion for a vote of censure upon his conduct.

All of which actions and declarations combined show a lamentable imperfection of head or heart, or of both combined, and demonstrate the necessity of checking the propensity to promote that exaltation of Mr. Adams' reputation, which would give currency to his pernicious opinions, and applause to his defective action; and of proclaiming to the world that we neither encourage political support of the man, nor approve of the general course of his public opinions or conduct, in reference to slavery.

The Convention resolved, that the cordial thanks of the American A. S. Society be, and hereby are presented to the trustees of the Second Independent Universalist Church of Philadelphia, for their liberality and kindness in opening their house for the meeting of said Society.

The President announced that the Committee had taken up in cash and pledges \$611 46, and a silver watch and pencil case. At 4 o'clock, the meeting adjourned sine die.

ROBERT PURVIS, Pres.

BESS S. JONES, MARY GREW, Wm. A. WILLET, ALICE ELIZA HAMILTON, Secretaries.

THE IRISH IN AMERICA.

Having seen placards about the streets of the city, stating that Mr. Mooney would lecture in the Marlboro' Chapel, on Tuesday evening, the present week, on 'The Irish in America,' and supposing, from the fact that the said Mooney had elsewhere publicly assailed the abolitionists, that he might attempt, in the course of his remarks, to prejudice the minds of his audience against the anti-slavery movement, we went to hear what he might say. Nothing, however, was advanced on the subject of slavery; the object of the lecturer being to extol Irish patriotism as manifested in the revolutionary struggle and the last war in defence of American liberty—and particularly to refute Mr. Webster's assertion in his Bunker Hill monument speech, that it is to the Protestant Reformation this country is indebted for its civil and religious freedom, by showing that religious peculiarities had nothing to do with the war for independence, and that Catholics were not less zealous in carrying it on than Protestants.

Mr. Mooney is an extremely dull and barren speaker, and presented his facts in a loose and awkward manner; but he certainly made out his case—to wit, that there is no difference between Catholics and Protestants in their mode of treating enemies; that they are equally animated by a desire to 'kill, slay and destroy,' and can readily unite, in a brotherly way, to shed the blood of their oppressors. In the light of Christianity, this fact is far from being creditable to either of these parties. It shows that their religion is worthless, and that, though they both profess to take the Prince of Peace for their leader, they know him not, and belong not to his kingdom. For they who follow him are possessed of his spirit, and delight to walk in his footsteps; and as he came to lay down his life for his enemies, to save man's lives and not to destroy them, so they delight to walk in his footsteps.

Worldly religion is no part of Christianity. Patriotism is but another name for moral cowardice and enlightened selfishness, actuated by a desire to secure its own ends by the most unwholesome means, and bounded by certain degrees of latitude and longitude. It may boastingly recount its bloody exploits, but these are proofs not of a loving but of a murderous spirit. It is shocking to hear certain members of the same family existing in view of the merciless destruction of other members, by their prowess. A blessing is pronounced on peace-makers, but none on those who engage in war, for any purpose. Let us cease to tell how the Americans slaughtered the British, or the British the Americans, or how brave are the Irish in battle, as a matter of congratulation or pride. Who doubts their ability to act as wild beasts, and tear each other to pieces, if they will? Who supposes that they are not capable of exhibiting a large amount of animal courage and desperation, in cases of emergency? But is this a theme to be proudly dwelt upon by those who are created in the Divine image, 'but a little lower than the angels'? O, this atheistical denial of human brotherhood! O, this savage disposition to return evil for evil, give blow for blow, take life for life! Of what consequence is it where a man was born, or by what name he is called—whether he is an American, a Briton, an Irishman, or an African? Is he to be less esteemed, or more cruelly treated, on that account? Is he to be shot down like a dog, for attempting to do us an injury, if he happen to belong to a foreign territory, any sooner than if he were our next door neighbor, possessing the same evil spirit? Away with these national castes! Down with these geographical partition walls! 'A man's man, for a' that,' and he should be a brother to every other man on the face of the globe. If war is favorable to human liberty, then peace is the enemy of our race! If warriors and patriots deserve to be crowned with laurels, then Jesus Christ may not be held up for our example, nor claim to be the Son of God!

Mr. Mooney should not be anxious to prove that the Irish know how to fight as bravely as any other people. He should seek to inspire them with an abhorrence of man-killing, and a spirit that can return nothing but good for evil. He should teach them, that they who take the sword shall perish by the instrument of death. He should inculcate upon their minds the superiority of moral courage to brute force, the potency of love and brotherly kindness in opposition to every species of injustice and oppression, the unquenchable nature of christian non-resistance, the sublime and world-reconciling doctrine that one God hath created us, and we are all children of the same common Father. But he can do them no good by inflating their vanity as Irishmen; by appealing to their animal passions, rather than to their moral instincts; by searching the pages of history for examples of Irish valor; by exciting in their minds a spirit of hostility toward those who are wrongfully oppressed in Ireland. All the warriors and patriots who have ever appeared on earth shrink into nothingness in contrast with that great and good philanthropist, Father MATTHEW. Their brows are knit in wrath, but his is placid as an angel's; their garments are red with human gore, but on his there rests no stain of blood; they seek to conquer by fire and the sword, but he by clarity and good-will; they act in behalf of a select number, but he for all mankind.

How exalted is the present position, how majestic the attitude of DANIEL O'CONNELL! He gloriously repudiates all other weapons but those of justice, truth and freedom. He is leading his forces against British tyranny under the banner of peace, and conquering through 'the unresistible might of weakness.' He influences on the minds of his followers the safety, the duty of abstaining from all violence, no matter what may be the provocation; and stands forth as the great apostle of non-resistance for Ireland, his countrymen and of all men. His language to his countrymen is—'First, foremost, and above all, I advise perseverance in peace and order; perseverance in avoiding any species of riot or violence whatever, no matter what the provocation may be, no matter what the vexation; still, peace, order, and TOTAL ABSTINENCE FROM VIOLENCE. In all and every event, I reiterate—peace, order, and NO VIOLENCE. No political change can be worth the price of any one crime, and, above all, of one single drop of human blood.' Is this the language, this advice, this spirit of 'patriotism'—or of something infinitely higher and better? Did Patrick Henry so resist the tyranny of England? Did Washington so counsel? Did Warren, Hancock and Adams so talk, in those vaunted 'times that tried men's souls'? O, no! What then? Is O'Connell a craven? Is his spirit servile? Is his wisdom foolishness, his bravery cowardice, his devotion to the interests of Ireland a sham? Or will it be said that he is a hypocrite, who is counselling physical non-resistance merely from motives of policy, until the proper time arrive for declaring war?

In declaring that 'no political change can be worth the price of one single drop of human blood,' Daniel O'Connell has recorded his testimony against every revolutionary struggle that has been characterized by violence, from the days of William Tell down to the present time, not excepting the revolution of 1776. But, while he thus dissuades from the shedding of blood, does he advise his oppressed countrymen to hug their chains—to crouch beneath the eye of despotism—to make no efforts to obtain their complete enfranchisement? No. He is as far removed from object servility, on the one hand, as he is from brutal revenge, on the other. He tells them to assert their manhood—to laugh to scorn the hired soldiery with which Ireland swarms—to meet carnal weapons with those of reason, truth, charity—to give no occasion to British tyranny, but boldly confront it on all occasions, and unflinchingly demand 'Justice, not lawless'—and to proclaim to the world that 'Repeal must not be abandoned.' Well and truly does he say—'It is a noble experiment, that of endeavoring to obtain the restoration of political franchises and rights by the use of means strictly and exclusively 'peaceable and moral.' And inspiringly does he exclaim—'Rally round me in this noble experiment, this glorious struggle. Be not ashamed—be not (oh! need I say it?) be not dismayed. Peace, order, tranquillity—these are our arms. WITH THESE WE ARE CERTAIN OF SUCCESS.'

And what can England do with O'Connell or Ireland, under such circumstances? Is she possessed with this demonstration of 'moral suasion'? Does she know how to meet it with her military and naval power? Did she not endeavor to turn the great Clontarf meeting into an Irish massacre, and so to cause peaceful endurance to pass its bounds, in order that she might find a pretext to pour out the blood of good Ireland like water? Is she not at her wit's end, and feeling like a drunken man, to do and to do? Of what avail are her cannon and bomb-shells, her forts and castles, her naval ships and regiments of soldiers? Truth is imperious to the sword, right cannot be shot down by the musket. No government was ever so ludicrous, so despicable, so helpless a predicament. England is at present the laughing-stock, Ireland the admiration of the world. England has nothing to rely on in this sublime conflict but her brute force, for the use of which she can find no occasion. Ireland has all the facts and arguments, all the right and equity, all the sympathies and good-wills of universal humanity, on her side, and these she can and will wield with tremendous, omnipotent, triumphant effect.

Mr. Mooney, in eulogizing the revolutionary struggle, forgot to state that they who participated in it were enslaving their fellow-men while they were resisting unto blood a three penny tax on tea. He also forgot to mention, as the result of that struggle, that the right of petition is not now enjoyed by the American people, simply that freedom of speech is not tolerated on the floor of Congress, except in favor of the base tyrants and bloody-minded assassins who represent the thrice-cursed South in that body. Nor did he allude to the fact, that one-sixth portion of the American population are now pining in chains and slavery—as large a number as the entire population of the country in 1776! 'Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord. Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?'

Mr. Mooney spoke in exalted terms of the patriotism and valor of General Jackson, particularly in connection with the battle of New-Orleans. He said that the General was born in an emigrant ship on his passage from Ireland to this country, and that he proudly claimed to have nothing but genuine Irish blood in his veins. But Mr. M. omitted to inform his audience that General Jackson has been a slave-trader, and holds as goods and chattels a number of his fellow-creatures in bondage; and is an unrelenting despot in heart and in practice. Such an atrocious criminal no country ought to be anxious to claim as a native-born citizen.

may be the provocation; and stands forth as the great apostle of non-resistance for Ireland, his countrymen and of all men. His language to his countrymen is—'First, foremost, and above all, I advise perseverance in peace and order; perseverance in avoiding any species of riot or violence whatever, no matter what the provocation may be, no matter what the vexation; still, peace, order, and TOTAL ABSTINENCE FROM VIOLENCE. In all and every event, I reiterate—peace, order, and NO VIOLENCE. No political change can be worth the price of any one crime, and, above all, of one single drop of human blood.' Is this the language, this advice, this spirit of 'patriotism'—or of something infinitely higher and better? Did Patrick Henry so resist the tyranny of England? Did Washington so counsel? Did Warren, Hancock and Adams so talk, in those vaunted 'times that tried men's souls'? O, no! What then? Is O'Connell a craven? Is his spirit servile? Is his wisdom foolishness, his bravery cowardice, his devotion to the interests of Ireland a sham? Or will it be said that he is a hypocrite, who is counselling physical non-resistance merely from motives of policy, until the proper time arrive for declaring war?

In declaring that 'no political change can be worth the price of one single drop of human blood,' Daniel O'Connell has recorded his testimony against every revolutionary struggle that has been characterized by violence, from the days of William Tell down to the present time, not excepting the revolution of 1776. But, while he thus dissuades from the shedding of blood, does he advise his oppressed countrymen to hug their chains—to crouch beneath the eye of despotism—to make no efforts to obtain their complete enfranchisement? No. He is as far removed from object servility, on the one hand, as he is from brutal revenge, on the other. He tells them to assert their manhood—to laugh to scorn the hired soldiery with which Ireland swarms—to meet carnal weapons with those of reason, truth, charity—to give no occasion to British tyranny, but boldly confront it on all occasions, and unflinchingly demand 'Justice, not lawless'—and to proclaim to the world that 'Repeal must not be abandoned.' Well and truly does he say—'It is a noble experiment, that of endeavoring to obtain the restoration of political franchises and rights by the use of means strictly and exclusively 'peaceable and moral.' And inspiringly does he exclaim—'Rally round me in this noble experiment, this glorious struggle. Be not ashamed—be not (oh! need I say it?) be not dismayed. Peace, order, tranquillity—these are our arms. WITH THESE WE ARE CERTAIN OF SUCCESS.'

And what can England do with O'Connell or Ireland, under such circumstances? Is she possessed with this demonstration of 'moral suasion'? Does she know how to meet it with her military and naval power? Did she not endeavor to turn the great Clontarf meeting into an Irish massacre, and so to cause peaceful endurance to pass its bounds, in order that she might find a pretext to pour out the blood of good Ireland like water? Is she not at her wit's end, and feeling like a drunken man, to do and to do? Of what avail are her cannon and bomb-shells, her forts and castles, her naval ships and regiments of soldiers? Truth is imperious to the sword, right cannot be shot down by the musket. No government was ever so ludicrous, so despicable, so helpless a predicament. England is at present the laughing-stock, Ireland the admiration of the world. England has nothing to rely on in this sublime conflict but her brute force, for the use of which she can find no occasion. Ireland has all the facts and arguments, all the right and equity, all the sympathies and good-wills of universal humanity, on her side, and these she can and will wield with tremendous, omnipotent, triumphant effect.

Mr. Mooney, in eulogizing the revolutionary struggle, forgot to state that they who participated in it were enslaving their fellow-men while they were resisting unto blood a three penny tax on tea. He also forgot to mention, as the result of that struggle, that the right of petition is not now enjoyed by the American people, simply that freedom of speech is not tolerated on the floor of Congress, except in favor of the base tyrants and bloody-minded assassins who represent the thrice-cursed South in that body. Nor did he allude to the fact, that one-sixth portion of the American population are now pining in chains and slavery—as large a number as the entire population of the country in 1776! 'Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord. Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?'

Mr. Mooney spoke in exalted terms of the patriotism and valor of General Jackson, particularly in connection with the battle of New-Orleans. He said that the General was born in an emigrant ship on his passage from Ireland to this country, and that he proudly claimed to have nothing but genuine Irish blood in his veins. But Mr. M. omitted to inform his audience that General Jackson has been a slave-trader, and holds as goods and chattels a number of his fellow-creatures in bondage; and is an unrelenting despot in heart and in practice. Such an atrocious criminal no country ought to be anxious to claim as a native-born citizen.

THE TENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR WILL OPEN AT AMORY HALL, ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19.

The great variety of things rare, unique, new and beautiful, from London, Paris, Dublin, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and many other places, together with all that have been collected at home, combine to make this an unequalled opportunity for the choice of CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR'S PRESENTS.

Among other attractive and valuable selections for the occasion are expected:

TWO CASES OF ARTICLES FROM PARIS, Comprising Bonnets and articles of Ladies' Dress, Bronzes, Printing Press, gilt Balloons, filled with gas, safe for drawing-room use, Bonbons, Boxes of Toys, Medallions, plated Play Services, small accessories, Statuettes in or moule, Fourrures de Bureau, &c.

THE BOOK TABLE Will be furnished with every kind of beautiful writing material, in the most excellent taste. Lewiston Seals, beautifully cut, boxes of Sealing Wax, Wafers of different kinds—a few of the Monuments of Paris. Paperies—ornamented and plain, of unexceptionable taste, in boxes, portfolios, cases and sachets; Pictorial Letter-paper, of eight or ten varieties; rare Autographs, Old Books;—the entire manuscript of O'Connell's Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury, very valuable; Gustave de Beaumont's book on Ireland, in English, translated by W. Taylor, the best book on Ireland extant, and not yet published here; Abby's Travels in the United States, (never re-published,) models of English and Swiss cottage architecture; Card-cases of the Killarney arboreal wood; Porcelain Envelopes, and four other kinds; embellished Music Paper; Wood of York Minister; exquisite water-color sketches of Rhine scenery from Nonnesworth, Johannesburg, Cologne, &c.; pen and ink drawings, Bristol board, outline drawings from the Muses of the Vatican, &c. &c.

On the first day of the Fair will be published THE LIBERTY BELL, containing articles from Dr. Bowring, Emily Taylor, Garrison, Rogers, Pierpont, Harriet Martineau, the Duchess of Sutherland, Lucretia Mott, James Haughton, R. D. Webb, J. B. Lowell, William and Mary Howitt, and other distinguished persons of England and America.

TENNESSEE WARE. Those who engaged articles of this beautiful ware, after the last year's invoice was disposed of, are informed that the requisite selection has arrived, consisting of every variety of small articles, taper-stands, paper-folders, winders, tea-caddies, jappanned and gilt Portfolio-stand, a new and beautiful article, &c.

STATUETTES. After the antique; and a few copies of the most celebrated works of modern sculptors, but principally classic subjects.

VARIETIES. Of infant's Dresses, gentlemen's linen, Dress Waistcoats, silk Aprons, richly quilted Skirts, Bags of every stitch and color, in Berlin worsted, wrought with gold and steel beads; Tapestry, Tabouret, ottoman, screen and water-table Fittings; ladies', gentlemen's and children's wretched Slippers; new Neck-ties and Waistcoats of knitted woolen, Chenille, wrought blue satin Petticoat, trimmed with swan's-down; an entirely new fashion of ladies' Gloves for drawing-room use; splendid Sofa and Chair-Nets, Purses, Cuffs, Muffs, Mufflers; Needlebooks and pins and toilette cushions, of dozens of varieties; Net Napkins, shawls, cloths, Book-marks, various sizes of Brichees, Stamboul, sofa and elbow cushions, Puzzles, children's Dresses, of a new material; satin Ornaments for the neck, very handsome, being the Tartans of the clans whose names are also family names of Massachusetts; a few 'Alice Mauds', a small shawl for girls; Balls, Bats, Whistles, miniature Vessels, and all manner of boys' play things, Dolls, Baskets, lined with silk; a pair of splendid Bell-Pulls.

PAINTINGS. Many valuable Paintings, both landscapes and portraits. The earlier Presidents, highly finished copies from Stuart; Roman Lady, an original Vandyke; Portraits, by excellent artists, of Dr. Channing, Dr. Noth, Dr. Griffin, Alexander Hamilton, DeWitt Clinton, and various other distinguished statesmen and divines.

REFRESHMENTS. Consisting of tea, coffee, ice creams, sandwiches, confectionary, &c.

CHRISTMAS TREES. This beautiful and magnificent spectacle of the Christmas Tree, with appropriate musical services, will be on Monday, the evening of Christmas day, December 20th, at the MELODEON.

The front of which will be illuminated for the occasion, and all arrangements made by which to prevent inconvenience in the entrance and exit of a great number of persons.

M. W. Chapman, Levisia Hilton, Jan T. G. Phillips, Hannah Tufte, Mary G. Chapman, Catherine Sargent, Susan Cabot, M. A. W. Johnson, Eliza Lee Follen, Caroline Weston, Anna R. Philbrick, Anna Boadette, Mary Young, Sarah B. Russell, Harriet Jackson, Helen E. Garrison, Mary F. Rogers, Louis Loring, Louisa M. Sewall, Jane Warren Weston, Caroline F. Williams, Thankful Southwick, Abby Southwick, Henrietta Southwick, Mary Willey, Maria White, Marian Fuller.

THE FAIR. To the Anti-Slavery Friends in the Vicinity. The Hall (AMORY HALL) will be ready for your reception on Tuesday morning, the 19th, very early. Such as find it necessary to come on Monday the 18th will find the Hall in process of arrangement.

Planning to send in plenty of green trimmings of the running vine, &c. to arrive at the Hall on the afternoon of Friday, or the morning of Saturday the 16th, or at the Anti-Slavery Office, if sent earlier in the week.

NOTICE. The friends of the cause are informed, that donations of cream, eggs, sugar, butter, lard, fruit of all kinds; in short, every kind of provision will, if sent to Mr. MARJORAM, confectioner, MARSHALL-STREET, be made into suitable forms for the benefit of the Fair.

Anti-Slavery Fair. The annual Fair of the Weymouth and Braintree Anti-Slavery Sewing Circle took place on the Tuesday and Wednesday of last week. Our success was greater than we had anticipated. The receipts were \$60 02, and our expenses were but \$2 54, so we feel amply rewarded for our exertions.

We are much indebted to the friends residing

POETRY.

From the British Friend.

THE NIGHT AFTER THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO.

I stood in fancy on that field, the awful fight was o'er,
The volleying musketry had ceased, and cease'd the
cannon's roar;

A veil of vaporous mist hung o'er the scene of death
below,
Where, as in one vast charnel-house, repose'd both
friend and foe.

The shout of 'Vive l'Empereur,' no longer rent the air,
And hush'd was England's battle-cry, both heard so
lately there;

The trumpet's brazen voice no more raised brief
shrill peal,
The rolling drum had cease'd its din, and cease'd the
clash of steel.

On the horizon's eastern edge the pallid orb of night
Arose, and o'er the battle's wreck threw wide her
very light;

Shedding a soft and beautiful ray on helm and cuirass
bright,
As dented, hack'd, and rent, they lay on the red field
of fight.

I wander'd o'er that dismal plain, among the count-
less dead,
Where 'garments roll'd in blood' proclaim'd most
true the warrior's trade;

My gory pathway thickly strewn with fast expiring
men,
Veteran and youth left there to die;
I trust in God no mortal eye,
A scene so life with agony,
Will e'er behold again!

Many from whom the spark of life had fled forever-
more,
Still grasp'd with arm convulsive clutch their sabres
steep'd in gore;

While o'er the features of the slain the noiseless
moonbeams stole,
Depicting Rage, Revenge, and Hate, fell demons of
the soul!

I turn'd to gaze upon the field, and by the moon's pale
ray,
I saw a female form bend o'er
The soldier, on his bed of gore,
And added by a lamp she bore,
A moment on his features pore,
Then turn in haste away.

Age had impair'd her frame, but still, with speedy step
she sought
Each spot where iron shower, like hail,
Borne upon the wintry gale,
Its work of death had wrought.

Swiftly she sped o'er broken ground, o'er shattered
sword and gun;
Yes, gentle reader, true my tale;
With many a stifled sob and wail,
And cheek with terror ghastly pale,
A widow sought her son.

Word had been brought that he had fallen upon the
field that day,
A musket-ball had pierc'd his side,
And from the wound, the crimson tide
Of life ebb'd fast away.

One who had fought close in his rear,
These tidings to his mother bore,
And urg'd by food maternal care,
Offering to Heaven a fervent prayer,
She sought the battle plain—
That spot where late the summer corn
Wax'd proudly in the breeze of morn;

But now, by trampling hoofs upturn'd,
Showered to the eye a mass forlorn,
Of blood-bespinkled grain!

Near and more near unto the spot whereon I stood
she drew,
And from the lamp a flickering ray
Upon the pallid dead that lay
Around her path, she threw.

At length she paus'd, and with a cry of wild uncertainty
wail'd,
She knelt upon the ensanguin'd ground,
Her son, her hapless son, was found,
His blood had steep'd the sod around,
But now had cease'd to flow!

Then to his lips she closely press'd
Her anxious ear, as if possess'd
Of hope that still within his breast
The vital spark might glow!

Advancing now to where she knelt, I offered friendly
aid;
She gave a shriek that pierc'd the air,
A wail of deep and dire despair;
But to my wish her grief to share,
No conscious heed she paid.

I wip'd the soldier's clotted brow,
And rais'd the drooping head;
No human skill avail'd him now,
His spirit long had fled!

That well-knit frame, that sinewy arm
A few short hours gone past,
Had mingled in the mighty stir,
Endued with young and vigorous life,
In death were stiffening fast!

'My child!' the frantic parent cried,
'My own, my long-loved boy!
Would that with thee I might have died,
My comfort, hope and joy!

Of every solace now bereft,
No friend remain like thee!—
At length she ceased the loud lament,
Then clasp'd her bony hands, and bent
A suppliant knee.

Father of mercies, hear my prayer,
Upon thy awful throne;
Renew each day thy gracious care;
Thy heavenly love, oh, let me share;
Teach me uncomplaining to bear
My lot, now drear and lone.

Or, rather, from this earthly scene
Of trouble, sin, and woe,
Remove thy poor and aged frame—
Life burns but with a sickly flame—
Though unprepared I go.

I trust in my Redeemer's name,
(Who died for all a death of shame),
To reach the heavenly shore;
Let but thy gracious will be done,
She cried, then sank upon her son,
Grown'd once, but breathe no more.

Oh, War! oh, horrid War! oh, when will all thy
miseries cease!

When will the nations of the earth be wise and free
in peace?

When man in the scathing knife shall turn the
bristling spear,

And beaten into ploughshares bright,
The insatiate sword from mortal sight,
Forever disappear!

T. F.
Maidstone, 10th mo. 1843.

FORGIVENESS.

How beautifully falls
From human lips that blessed word—
Forgiveness—it is an attribute of God!

The sound which openeth Heaven—renews again
On earth, lost Eden's bloom, and flings
Hope's halcyon o'er the waste of life.

Thrice happy he, whose heart has been so school'd
In the deep lessons of humanity,
That he can give the utterance; it imparts
Celestial grandeur to the human soul,
And maketh man an angel.

THE LIBERATOR.

Ancient and Modern Phariseism Compared.

The Zion's Herald and Wesleyan Journal of the
25th of October, contains an article headed, 'Ancient
and Modern Non-Resistance Compared.' The
subject is 'Prayer.'

The writer tells us that 'ancient non-resistance,'
'Jesus Christ' and his disciples, 'were praying men.'
He tells us 'Christ retired into secret places to pray.'
Can he tell us of an instance in which he ever prayed
in public, and before the gaze of the world, except in
the single instance of his agony on the cross? 'He
arose a great while before day to pray.' Was that
before a popular audience in the synagogue, and under
the eyes of the priests, that they might say he was
a praying man? 'He prayed at the grave of
Lazarus.' Was it vocal prayer? Did any hear the
words of that prayer but his Father? Evidently not;
for the language is, 'he groaned in spirit'—and af-
terward he lifted up his voice in thanking him who
was his prayer. No one heard him pray.

'He taught his early followers to pray.' Did he teach
them to pray in public, and in the presence of an un-
godly world, and the public praying priests and Pharisees?
Did he not distinctly forbid them to do so?

'They prayed with great fervency when the Holy
Ghost fell on them on the day of Pentecost.' Prayer
was made without ceasing by the church for Peter
when he was in prison. [Do the churches now offer
prayer without ceasing for Christ's poor disciples,
now in the prison of southern slavery? Non-resistance
do. Most of the priests of Boston positively
refused to pray for poor George Latimer when he was
in prison.] 'They frequently prayed when persecuted,'
when together, when they were to part, when
entering upon some great and responsible work, &c.
&c. [And our modern Pharisees always make public
prayer when they are about to do any thing de-
signed to impose upon the blind veneration of an un-
thinking, priest-ridden people. If they are about to
engage in any thing suggested by the prince of dark-
ness, they begin with public prayer, that they may
take possession of the minds of the people in advance,
particularly when they are preparing to devour
widows' houses, and bind heavy burdens on men's
shoulders.]

But I challenge 'James,' or any other modern
Pharisee, to show that Christ or his disciples
prayed any other time than in secret, or when the
disciples were together, and the ungodly world shut
out. I challenge him to show that the world of un-
believers and public praying priests knew they held
meetings for prayer. They were as obnoxious to the
popular religionists of that day as are non-resistance
to the chief priests and Pharisees of the present.

They did not pray in the synagogues when they went
into them to teach. They did not proclaim in the
synagogues, in the ears of all the people, that there
would be prayer meetings at such a time and place.
Their assemblies for prayer were as secret from the
knowledge of public praying, self-righteous priests
and formal worshippers in the synagogues, as if each one
was alone in his closet. They did not take pains to
let the sneering Jews know they prayed in private,
so as to get rid of the charge of being prayerless men.

They did not seek to appear outwardly righteous un-
to men, for they heard their Master say to these public
praying professors—'Ye are like whited sepulchres,
that indeed appear beautiful without, but within are
full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness; even
so ye, also, outwardly appear righteous unto men, but
within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.'

'James' says further—'Do modern non-resistance
prayer? Where? Do they pray in secret? It is not
my province to say—but we have cause to fear.
Then those who pray in secret must proclaim it to the
world, and particularly to the priest, lest they should
'have cause to fear!' I truly believe that the priests
and public praying Pharisees, who proclaim their own
righteousness (not by deeds but in words) have great
cause to fear the influence of non-resistance; but I do
not think proper to seek to gain popular favor, by
letting our left hand know what our right hand doeth.

He asks—'Do they have prayer meetings? Do they
pray in their public assemblies?' I have al-
ready shown that praying in public assemblies is not
in accordance with primitive Christianity. None but
Pharisees did it; and the question about prayer meet-
ings has also been answered. He admits, in the be-
ginning, that Christ and his disciples were non-resistance-
ists—says that they were praying non-resistance-
ists. He says he knows 'some pious men who still pray
in their families, who are partially under the influ-
ence of this heresy.' Then non-resistance is heresy,
even though non-resistance do pray! Christ and his
disciples were 'praying non-resistance-ists,' but non-resistance
is heresy! Ergo, Christ and his disciples were
heretics!!! That is just what they were called by the
public praying people of their day. We are quite
willing to be classed with such heretics, and to lose
caste with modern priests and Pharisees.

He exclaims—'Blessed Jesus! Hast thou said, if
any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of
thee? [No—Paul said this.] O, then! how can we
be without prayer?' And afterward he says of these
heretical non-resistance-ists—'It may be possible that
they

'Refuse to Heaven to raise a prayer,
Because they've no connexion there;
—and that

'Their humble vows they dare not breathe
To powers they've no acquaintance with.'

I will only ask friend 'James,' whether he was
influenced by 'the spirit of Christ' in quoting the
ridiculous John Trumbull in this connexion? and
leave it for his own conscience to decide, whether he
is Christ's or not. I can repeat, as applicable to him-
self and his like, his closing intercession—'O, Jesus,
my perfect pattern! Forgive them, for they know not
what they do.' We wish them to repent; we would
not harm a hair of their heads; we can bear persecu-
tions, mobbings, snubbings, and imprisonments, though
inflicted by modern priests and professors, as some of
us have done. We would and can observe the injunc-
tion of the apostle, 'Dearly beloved, avenge not
yourself; we can, in the spirit of Christ, wear
the people against them, proving them to be blind
guides, whited sepulchres, Pharisees and hypocrites.
We can see their end, and weep over them, as Christ
wept over Jerusalem, saying, 'If thou hadst known,
even thou, in this thy day, the things that belong to
thee; but now they are hid from thine eyes.' Such
was the melancholy condition of the Jewish
church and its priesthood, and such is the condition
of the sects of these days and their priesthood.

Sacramento, Me., Nov. 1843. D. S. G.

Thanksgiving.

Mr. Garrison:
I had the pleasure of spending this 'time-honored
festival' with my friends, in the goodly city of Bos-
ton this year.

To you, my dear sir, and to many others, I presume,
this day has but few charms. Yet there are many
pleasant associations connected with this festival,
around which all true minds must delight to dwell.
Kindred and friends, absent through the year, return
on this occasion, and greet each other with warm
and glowing hearts.

Although reminded, occasionally, at these festivals
of the 'vacant place' which death has made among
us, there is still pleasure in the thought that we are
not probably often to experience these scenes.

I attended church at Mr. Barrett's, where there is
much to dislike, as well as to admire. One thing I
dislike extremely; it is an effort apparently, here
elsewhere among the clergy in the city, to maintain
a false dignity, by appearing in a costume, on these
and other days of worship, more suited to the times
when 'cocked hats' were in vogue.

The subject was 'the elevated position in which
this country stands among the nations of the earth.'
There were some fine statements in the discourse, to
which I could not assent. He exultingly put this
question: 'What American citizen would exchange

his country, for any other on the face of the globe?'
Now, I can not see anything of a class of citizens
in this country, (I call them citizens,) who, I
thought, would not hesitate, if they had the opportunity,
to change situations with almost any other
class in the world. Mr. B. will not doubt the cor-
rectness of this opinion, when he calls to mind those
who were slaves in these United States, but are now
free citizens and most loyal subjects of
Queen Victoria, residing in Canada. How did they
get there? They ran away from their masters, whom
we are told they love so well, and from this beloved
country—free America—for the cold and uncongenial
regions of Canada.

How blind are the clergy! And those who do
so, how hateful are they to speak out on this
most interesting of all subjects! I know that, in
some societies, with but few individual exceptions,
the people are hungering for something of this kind.
They wish to see the subject of slavery laid bare in
all its naked deformity. This is no guess-work. I
know it to be true.

In his panegyric on the New-England States, and
especially on Massachusetts, Mr. B. said—'Here
every person is secured in his equal rights.' Does
he not know that, in this State, for certain offences,
the rogue who has money can strut about the street,
repeating his deprecations; while for the same offence,
the poor man, who has a family dependent on him for
support, must pay his penalty by going to prison?

How sacredly, moreover, are 'equal rights' re-
spected, even in the churches of Boston! Can a
colored family here have the same privilege to oc-
cupy any pew in the house, that others do, which
may be for sale or to let? With but few exceptions,
they cannot. The piety of this boasted city of Bos-
ton, in the face of the doctrine, and promising to
be such an outrage on common decency!

In the afternoon, passing by the Miller Taberna-
cle, and observing persons there congregated, I stepped
in with a view to ascertain how soon, now, it
was expected the elements would melt with fervent
heat, and the world be burnt up. I found the audi-
ence small, with a dull preacher, who seemed to
be content with the usual topics, and to have no
certainly come when they should inherit the earth
alone, and the wicked be burnt up. I could not help
thinking that the two that were sitting beside me
had confidence in the preacher, for they occasionally
gave a response by way of a good loud roar.

Thus, in the churches of Boston, these last weeks,
having a little leisure while here. If you think they
are worth any thing, you are at liberty to make such
use of them as you deem proper.

Boston, Dec. 1, 1843. C.

The following faithful and well-merited rebuke
is, we believe, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Hall,
a Unitarian preacher in Providence, a man of more
than ordinary moral courage and philanthropy for a
pulpit-occupant.

From the Providence Chronicle.

Dr. Lardner.

While this individual was in the city, and was
bringing all the attractions of his learning, his splen-
did apparatus, and his moral independence to bear
upon the conscience, it was useless to attempt to do
anything against him. But now that his lectures
are over, it may not be wholly vain to look a little
into his singular case. And whether vain or not, it
is a duty, and shall be performed, however feebly or
ineffectually. The humblest member of society may
speak without presumption, when the whole moral
sense of society is outraged.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.
True. If it is not your wife, you would strike him
to the ground, or throw him into a dungeon, or drive
him from the land. And if it were your neighbor's
wife, or any woman whom you knew, your condemnation
would be prompt and unsparring; and if he were
a man of high standing and great learning, it
would be prompt and unsparring. This man is no
more than a great many others.

'But the moral sense of society is not outraged,'
and this is the most singular fact of all. It is a new
fact. It deserves notice, if it be only as an era
in our moral and religious history. The case has never
occurred before. It is useless to compare it with
common cases, and as poor logic, as it is doubtful
principle, to extenuate it, by referring to other
cases. It is not a case of a single individual, but
of a whole people. This man is no more than a great
many others.

'True. And the man who robs your house, or brings
infamy upon your wife or daughter, is no more than
a great many others. Do you therefore hold him
excused, and give him your hand, or your money?
'But it is not my wife, that this man has ruined.